



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

---

APRIL, 1853.

---

## STIPULATED ARBITRATION.

*A Report made to the Senate of the United States, Feb. 23, 1853,*

BY HON. J. R. UNDERWOOD.

*The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom were referred the memorial of the American Peace Society, signed by its principal officers, and various other memorials, numerously signed, from many States of the Union, praying for the adoption of measures to avert the evils of war, and suggesting the propriety of "securing in our treaties with other nations, a provision for referring to the decision of umpires all misunderstandings that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiation," have had the same under consideration, and now report :*

That the subject of these memorials is of vast importance, involving inquiries into the effects produced by war upon the physical, intellectual, moral, and religious welfare of mankind, and, if these effects be found deleterious, then the consideration of plans to arrest the evil.

The committee, after due deliberation, are of opinion, that wars which successfully resist oppression may, in their results, more than compensate for the blood and treasure expended in their prosecution. But wars commenced to maintain the rights of the people, when unsuccessfully terminated, only strengthen the hands of despotism, and generally place those who have taken up arms to resist wrong, in a worse condition than they were in the beginning. The revolution by which the people of the United States broke the dominion of Great Britain, and established a free popular government, furnishes an instance where the consequences of war have fully compensated the expenditure. But this is a rare instance in the history of revolutions. It is unnecessary to refer to those which have been attempted, and have failed, leaving the oppressed in a worse condition after than before the war.

While the committee do not intend to deny the right of any people or nation to resort to war for the purpose of ridding themselves of oppression, or of defending themselves against aggression, when it cannot be accomplished by peaceable means, yet they regard the tendencies of war to be injurious to the progress of mankind in science, art, morals, civilization, and happiness; and hence it can be justified only upon the ground, that it is a less evil than that which can be avoided only by the resort to war. In this view, war presents itself as a choice between evils.

That war is an evil of stupendous magnitude in its effects upon the physical welfare of mankind, no one can deny who regards and reasons upon

incontrovertible facts. The business of war is to force and secure submission on the part of the enemy by inflicting a destruction of life and property. The purpose of a campaign is to conquer, to subdue the enemy. The means to accomplish it are found in the sacrifice of life in bloody battles, in the sacking of cities, in the devastation of countries, in the sinking of ships, in the seizure and confiscation of cargoes, and in forcing contributions from those who are overrun. The immediate object of war is to create human misery to such a degree, that those who suffer will thereby be influenced to yield to the demands, whether right or wrong, of those who inflict the injury, rather than prolong their sufferings by a continuance of the war. Under such a system, fathers, husbands, sons, and brothers are consigned, in the vigor of manhood, to sudden death, and their bodies often abandoned without burial, leaving mothers, wives, daughters, and sisters to lament with excruciating anguish the loss of that society which constituted their chief earthly happiness. But, even if they survive the battle, it may be at the expense of an eye, an arm, or a leg; and, when they retire from the army, if their bodies are not maimed and mutilated, their physical constitutions are often broken down, and they fall early victims to diseases contracted in the service. It is needless to comment upon the distress and wretchedness which families experience when deprived of those who supplied the wants of women and children with food and raiment. Every person can call to mind some known and familiar instance of a family whose comfort and happiness have been destroyed by the consequences of war. Individual and family sufferings are the confluent particles which form the great streams of national calamity; and the committee, without dwelling upon them, will proceed to present some general considerations and facts which, they, trust will exhibit the evils of war in a light so striking as to induce every patriot and philanthropist to labor for its extermination.

Armies, to render efficient service, must be composed of intelligent, able-bodied men—such as are capable, in civil employments, to increase greatly the products of agriculture, mechanism, and commerce, upon which the physical comforts of every people essentially depend. Abstract the labor of 100,000 men from the tillage of the earth, from the mechanic and manufacturing arts, and from the business of commerce, convert them into soldiers; and what consequences naturally follow the procedure?

The first is, that they become consumers, instead of producers—maintained, not by their own, but by the labor of others. However actively and industriously they may be engaged to meet and overcome the enemy, all their labors for such purposes, instead of adding to, only consume and waste, the food and raiment and implements furnished by the labor of others. The consequence is, that the laboring producers must work harder, to keep up their own customary supplies, and to support, in addition, the army of consumers and non-producers whose business it is to live on the labor of their friends, and to destroy the lives and property of their enemies.

The second consequence is, that the 100,000 men, taken from the industrial pursuits which create the means of comfortable living, and placed in an army to lead the life of soldiers, must be furnished with the implements and munitions which belong to their new trade of destruction. Swords, pistols, rifles, muskets, bayonets, cannon, powder, balls, and bombshells must be fabricated and supplied. In addition, there must be the means of transportation by land and water. Beasts of burden and wagons of all sorts, and without number, must be provided. Water-craft of all kinds and dimensions, from the common ferry-boat to the magnificent three-decked man-of-war ship, must be constructed or purchased. When a suitable armament is obtained, and military and naval operations begin, every movement is attended with deterioration and waste of material, making a perpetual renewal

absolutely necessary. The forage for horses, mules, and oxen, and the destruction and loss of animals and carriages attached to armies, constitute no inconsiderable item to be kept up by the labor of the country which furnishes the supplies.

The third consequence is, that, if the laboring classes, upon whom the burden falls of supporting the non-producing army in food and raiment, and of providing the munitions of war to render the army efficient, cannot do it for want of means, and the government under which they live cannot therefore venture to increase the taxes, the people and their government are driven by the urgency of circumstances to anticipate their revenues by borrowing money. Hence the creation of national debts, and with them a new set of non-producers, who live sumptuously upon the interest of their money, and by dealing in stocks. Thus the living generation are often required to toil and labor to discharge the principal and interest of national debts created in former ages. Besides the current and necessary annual expenditures of government, they are called on to pay the debts of centuries, and taxation becomes an intolerable burden.

That these are the natural consequences of war, no one can doubt who is at all acquainted with the history of nations, and their public debts. Exempt as are the people of the United States from oppressive taxation to meet the interest of their public debt, and small as that debt is compared with the debts of other nations whose resources are not equal to ours, yet it is well known that nearly the whole of our debt, exceeding, on the 1st of January last, \$65,000,000, has been the result of war. To show the burdens which wars entail on nations by public debts, the committee herewith present two tables, taken from Hunt's Merchants' Magazine of May, 1843. The first exhibits the public debt of Great Britain, taken from the budget of 1840, at various periods in British history; and the other gives the amount, in German dollars, of the debt of many nations of Europe, their population, and average of debt to each inhabitant.\* These tables may not be perfectly accurate, but, no doubt, approximate the truth sufficiently near for every purpose of fair argument and illustration. Taking into consideration the debts of the smaller European States and free cities, and adding them to the aggregate of debt as stated in the second table, it may be safely affirmed, that the total public debt of the States of Europe was not less than eight thousand

\* TABLE I.—Public Debt of Great Britain.

	Principal.	Int. & Mangt.
Debt of Great Britain at the revolution in 1689, . . . . .	£664,263	£39,855
Excess of debt contracted during the reign of William III. above debt paid off, . . . . .	17,730,439	1,771,067
Debt at the accession of Queen Ann in 1702, . . . . .	16,394,702	1,310,982
Debt contracted during Queen Ann's reign, . . . . .	37,750,661	2,040,416
Debt at the accession of George I. in 1714, . . . . .	54,145,363	3,351,358
Debt paid off during the reign of George I. above debt contracted, . . . . .	5,053,125	1,133,807
Debt at the accession of George II. in 1727, . . . . .	52,092,237	2,217,551
Debt contracted from the accession of George II. till the peace of Paris in 1763, three years after the accession of George III., . . . .	86,773,192	2,634,590
Debt in 1763, . . . . .	138,865,430	4,852,051
Paid during peace from 1763 to 1775, . . . . .	10,281,795	380,480
Debt at the commencement of the American war in 1775, . . . .	128,583,635	4,471,541
Debt contracted during the American war, . . . . .	121,267,993	4,980,201
Debt at the conclusion of the American war in 1784, . . . . .	249,851,628	9,451,772
Paid during peace from 1784 to 1793, . . . . .	10,501,380	243,277
Debt at the commencement of the French war in 1793, . . . .	239,350,148	9,208,495
Debt contracted during the French war, . . . . .	601,500,343	22,829,679
Total funded and unfunded debt on the 1st February, 1817, when the English and Irish exchequers were consolidated, . . . . .	840,850,491	32,038,291
Debt cancelled from February 1, 1817, to January 5, 1838, . . . .	48,544,049	2,576,713
Debt and charge thereon January 5, 1838, . . . . .	792,306,442	29,461,528

To convert pounds sterling into dollars, multiply by five.

millions of dollars in 1840!\* The annual interest on this enormous amount of debt, supposing it to average only four per cent. per annum, is equal to three hundred and twenty millions of dollars each year. In other words, each man, woman, and child, if the interest were raised by a capitation tax, would have to contribute \$1 29 per annum, in addition to the sums necessary to meet the annual expenditures of government for other purposes, estimating the countries which owe the debts to contain a population of 248,000,000. Turkey in Europe has been omitted in these calculations, because the committee had no data before them upon which that country could be included.

If we consider, by way of contrast, the more beneficial uses to which war-taxes and war-debts might be applied, could wars be avoided, we shall see more clearly the immense losses and deprivations which mankind have sustained in consequence of devoting their energies and resources to the purposes of war. Thus the interest on the European debt would pay an annual salary of \$400 to eight hundred thousand teachers of children. These teachers, allowing thirty children to each, could instruct twenty-four millions of children, of suitable ages, in the usual branches of a common education—as reading, writing, arithmetic, geography and grammar. Thus the debts of the States of Europe, created by wars, would, as an education fund, teach every child of suitable age within their territories those rudiments of learning which open the door to the highest attainments in science. What blessings would this confer upon the children of the lower classes of Paris and of

\*TABLE II.—*Debts of Europe, in German dollars—equal to about eighty-two cents of the United States currency.*

Countries	Debt,	No. inhab'ts.	Avg. to each inhab.
Holland,	800,000,000	3,000,000	266 66
England,	5,556,000,000	25,000,000	222 24
Frankfort-on-the-Maine,	5,000,000	55,000	90 91
France,	1,800,000,000	33,000,000	54 54
Bremen,	3,000,000	55,000	54 54
Hamburg,	7,000,000	155,000	45 16
Denmark,	93,000,000	2,100,000	44 57
Greece,	44,000,000	1,000,000	44 00
Portugal,	144,000,000	3,800,000	38 63
Lubeck,	1,700,000	45,000	97 78
Spain,	467,000,000	13,000,000	35 92
Austria,	380,000,000	12,000,000	31 67
Belgium,	120,000,000	4,000,000	30 09
Papal States,	67,000,000	2,500,000	26 80
Hesse Hamburg,	587,000	25,000	23 48
Saxe Meinengen,	3,000,000	140,000	21 43
Anhalt Rothen,	800,000	39,000	20 51
Brunswick,	5,000,000	260,000	19 23
Bavaria,	72,350,000	4,250,000	17 00
Naples,	126,000,000	7,600,000	16 58
Saxe Weimar,	3,000,000	240,000	12 50
Hanover,	19,000,000	1,700,000	11 47
Prussia,	150,000,000	13,500,000	11 11
Nassau,	3,700,000	370,000	10 00
Russia and Poland,	545,000,000	60,000,000	9 09
Baden,	11,000,000	1,250,000	8 80
Wurtemberg,	14,000,000	1,600,000	8 75
Parma,	3,700,000	430,000	8 60
Hesse Darmstadt,	6,250,000	800,000	7 81
Modene,	3,000,000	403,000	7 44
Sardinia,	32,000,000	4,500,000	7 11
Saxony,	11,000,000	1,700,000	6 47
Saxe Altenberg,	700,000	120,000	5 83

States whose debts do not amount to \$5 for each inhabitant, are omitted.—Total 10,499,710,000. A German authority, quoted by Hunt's Mer. Mag., Nov. 1851, puts the war-debts of Europe at 11,397,076,00 German dollars.—Ed.

London; and not only these, but upon the children of all the poor, whose circumstances prohibit the expenditure of money, even if they had it, in educating their children!

The interest for one year on European war-debts would construct eight thousand miles of railroad, and provide depots, locomotives, cars, and everything needful for the transportation of freight and travellers, at a cost per mile not exceeding \$40,000. Thus a railroad might be constructed from Paris to Canton, in China, for less than a year's interest on the war-debts of Europe.

The interest payable annually upon war-debts, is but a small portion of the annual burden imposed upon the people for war-purposes. The expense of keeping and sustaining large standing armies and navies is tenfold greater than paying the interest on national debts. And, although the nations of Europe have been at peace for many years, from recent information it appears, that there has been no diminution of their military establishments. The following extract, taken from a recent publication in London, and which refers to Parliamentary papers and the budgets for the years 1835 and 1852 in support of the truth of the statements, exhibits the condition of things on this point in regard to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The publication states: "While its (United Kingdom) national debt has not been materially diminished, its war establishment has been fearfully increased. In the space of seventeen years—namely, from 1835 to 1852—its armed men have multiplied from 145,846 in the one period, to 272,481 in the other, being an addition, in those comparatively few years, of no less than 126,635 men in arms." The publication proceeds to state, that an additional force of 80,000 men had recently been provided for "in the form of a militia, at a cost of £350,000 (\$1,750,000) to the country; and more recently still, they (the ministry,) have demanded and obtained, for an increased navy, another sum of £600,000, (\$3,000,000,) making together nearly one million sterling taken from the income of the empire in 1852, in addition to the large annual expenditure for similar purposes." The same publication states, that "in 1835 the whole cost of the army, navy and ordnance of Great Britain was £11,657,487 sterling, (\$58,287,435;) in 1852, the charge for the same departments (including the Caffre war, &c.) has risen to the startling sum of £16,500,000, (\$82,500,000,) being an increase of no less than £4,842,513 sterling; and this does not include the £600,000 recently added to the navy." We shall conclude these extracts by giving the commentary of the writer on the preceding facts. He says: "The injury which this immense drain on our national resources must inflict upon commerce, is incalculable. Take Manchester and Salford as an instance; their united population of about 400,000 inhabitants, according to the existing average of taxation, pay *annually*, for past, present and future wars, no less than the astonishing sum of £875,000, (\$4,375,000, or \$10 per head!) and at this rate such a population, during the last thirty years of peace, will have lost from their united resources, for war-purposes alone, the almost overwhelming sum of not less than *twenty-five millions sterling!* What the inhabitants of these two great boroughs could have accomplished with this vast amount, defies all description; but it is undeniable that solid improvements, and on a scale of the most commanding magnitude, in all the social, sanitary and intellectual departments of activity, might have been carried out to their full completion by those resources which, through a system of warlike extravagance, are now forever lost. The inhabitants of the United Kingdom at large will have contributed to this extravagant outlay, during the thirty years of peace, the perfectly bewildering amount of more than *one thousand two hundred and fifty millions!*—(\$6,250,000,000.)

"Nor does the agricultural market suffer less, in proportion, than the manufacturing, of which the following statement is a convincing and melancholy

proof. Its 600,000 laborers, who with their families, amount to nearly two millions and a half of the entire population, will not receive as wages, for their whole year's toil, more than fifteen millions sterling, (\$75,000,000;) while, for armed men alone, the country will pay, as stated above, upwards of sixteen millions (\$80,000,000) for the same space of time. Thus the tillers of the soil, whose hard and honest labor provides the substance of our daily bread, will receive for that labor millions less than men in arms, who, of necessity, must be mere idlers in the State, except when engaged in the work of mutual destruction."

It might seem useless further to pursue these investigations in reference to the States of Europe. But it is deemed proper to make a brief reference to the state of things now, or very recently, existing in France, taken from a translation of an article published in the *Siecle*. From this it appears that in France and Algeria there are kept up "102 regiments of infantry, ten battalions of foot chasseurs, three regiments of zouaves, three battalions of African light infantry, and nineteen companies of discipline. These corps contain 261,095 officers, non-commissioned officers, and soldiers, at an expense of pay and living alone of 78,000,000 francs," (equal to \$14,820,000.) The article proceeds to say: "Our fifty-eight regiments of cavalry, two squadrons of guides, and four companies of the body called *Cavaliers de Remonte*, contain 61,187 men and 44,707 horses, at an expense of 57,000,000 francs, (equal to \$10,830,000.) The artillery—which is divided into fourteen regiments, a regiment of pontoneers, four squadrons of park artillery, and thirteen companies of workmen—consists of 32,000 men and 748 horses, and the wagon-train of 5000 men and 4425 horses. The gendarmerie and veterans form a chapter of the budget quite apart."

The number of the gendarmerie and veterans is not stated, nor the annual sum required for their support. Neither is the annual cost of the artillery, engineers and wagon-train given. But, supposing that it is equal, in proportion, to that of the cavalry, it is not less than 33,683,000 francs, or \$6,399,770. Thus the army of France, exclusive of the gendarmerie and veterans, composed of 368,572 men and 61,018 horses, costs annually, to pay and support them, more than \$30,000,000 in peace. This estimate does not include the navy of France.

According to the foregoing data, the standing armies of Great Britain and France exceed 640,000 men. Including the armies of all other European States, the number cannot fall short of 2,000,000 men, without taking any account of the naval armaments and number of marines, sailors, and officers.\* Your committee have seen a publication in which it is estimated, that the annual charge upon the people of Europe to maintain their military establishment, is not less than \$500,000,000, and to pay the interest on their national debts not less than \$300,000,000. In the opinion of the committee, these estimates are fully sustained by the data they have examined. The thought is appalling, that the laboring and productive classes of Europe should be annually taxed to the extent of \$800,000,000 to pay interest on war-debts, and to support millions of men, withdrawn from the arts of agriculture, commerce, and mechanism, in idleness during peace, and to prepare them to destroy each other in times of war!

We will close these investigations by remarking, that our own public debt, nearly all of which is the consequence of war, and the expenses of our army and navy a single year—the army having cost \$8,689,530, and the navy, including dry-docks and ocean steam mail contracts, \$7,450,300, during the fiscal year ending in June, 1853, according to official reports—would build

\* In 1850, Baron von Reden, a very able statistician in Germany, stated that there were at that time full *four millions* actually under arms in Europe.—ED.

a railroad, at \$35,000 per mile, from the Mississippi river to San Francisco, in California. A single year's interest at six per cent. on the amount of our national debt, and the amount expended for military and naval purposes during the last fiscal year, would pay a salary exceeding \$200 to one hundred school teachers in every congressional district in the United States. We shall only allude to the system of pensions, and the burdens entailed on nations to support pensioners. For the next fiscal year, to meet these claims, more than \$2,000,000, according to the Secretary's report, will be wanting. All this is the consequence of war.

The facts and considerations already presented are enough to show what mankind have lost by applying their labor and money in scourging nations with the calamities of war. Had the labor and money, thus thrown away in making nations miserable, been applied in constructing roads and canals and telegraphs, in supplying towns and cities with pure water and other improvements, in building churches and school-houses, in procuring books and apparatus, and in paying teachers to instruct children, instead of paying soldiers to butcher their fellow-men in cold blood without knowing whom they are killing; if this wasted labor and money had been used with a view to the physical, intellectual and moral advancement of mankind, the imagination cannot grasp the incalculable blessings which would have been the result.

We shall not dwell upon the deleterious effects of war upon the moral and intellectual progress of mankind. To trace its consequences, and to show that no people can advance, when maddened and harrassed by the intense excitements and engagements which occupy them in a state of war, as they could in peace, would be to waste time in proving a self-evident proposition. We therefore dismiss this part of the subject, and take up the inquiry whether it be possible to prescribe a remedy for the evils of war, and, if so, what is the remedy.

It is an axiom sanctioned by the experience of mankind in all ages and under all circumstances, that no one can be trusted as judge in his own case. Civil governments are based upon the idea, that disinterested tribunals must be established in order to administer justice between contending individuals, and their conflicting claims. If individuals, members of the same society, and residing in the same neighborhood, cannot be allowed to judge of the extent of their injuries, and to redress, each for himself, the wrong of which he complains, because of his incapacity, under the influence of selfishness, to perceive what justice requires, and to keep himself within the boundaries of exact justice when he undertakes to right himself, how is it more reasonable that States, being only the aggregate of individuals, should, through their governments, be allowed to judge exclusively of the wrong suffered, and the extent and nature of the remedy to be applied? Are aggregates of men, or associated multitudes, exempt from all the passions, prejudices and selfishness which operate upon the individuals who compose them? Are governments less influenced by the spirit of aggression and aggrandizement than individuals? We think the history of nations furnishes a negative answer to these questions. The peace, happiness and good order of society imperatively demand the establishment of courts of justice, in which disinterested judges shall settle individual controversies; and we believe that civilization could hardly exist among any people where each individual was allowed to be the judge and avenger of his own wrongs. That governments should be allowed to exercise privileges and powers in deciding their disputes with other governments, which could not for a moment be conceded to individuals, can be tolerated only upon the ground of necessity. It may be said, and with truth in the present posture of the affairs of the world, that



there is no superior, paramount authority to which nations can apply for redress against each other, and therefore each must judge and redress for itself the wrong it suffers. We shall not deny this position in respect either to individuals, nations or governments, when they are independent, and not subject to the control of some higher power. Savages, in a state of nature, without the restraint of laws, must judge and act for themselves. Each must redress his own wrong, or engage others to assist him, as best he may. But, as men have emerged from a state of nature into the social system of establishing government, and surrendered the right of self-redress, except in cases where threatened spoliation and injuries may be averted by self-defence, and have been eminently blessed by making the surrender, it is worthy of the gravest consideration, whether nations and governments may not establish a tribunal into whose hands their right of self-redress may be safely surrendered. The several States, constituting the people and government of the United States under the control of the federal or national constitution, have surrendered their right of self-redress against each other, and against foreign nations and governments, in many highly important particulars. Perhaps it is not going too far to say, that this right has been fully surrendered to the general government in all cases where the injury complained of has been fully perpetrated and completed, retaining, however, the fullest right to repel the infliction of injuries from any quarter which may be attempted, and which are not consummated—just as any citizen may defend his person, his family, or his property against violent attacks, notwithstanding his surrender of the right of self-redress to his government in most cases. In the opinion of some of the committee, the day will come, in the progress of intelligence and Christianity, when nations will unite in establishing a tribunal in which all international controversies shall be adjudged and determined; but, as the committee do not at present intend to recommend measures to that extent, they forbear to go into details of the plan of its operation, or the reasons in support of it.

All that the committee are willing to advise and recommend for the present is, that, in the treaties which are hereafter to be made with foreign nations, it shall be stipulated between the contracting parties, that all differences which may arise shall be referred to arbitrators for adjustment. Under such stipulation, the board of arbitrators, or the single arbitrator, would be selected after the occurrence of the difficulty. Each party would be careful to select impartial persons, distinguished for their virtues and talents, and each would have the opportunity of objecting to any one proposed who might not possess these high qualities. In the opinion of the committee, the arbitrators should be eminent jurists having little or no connexion with political affairs. If the parties could not agree in the selection of arbitrators, and could not themselves settle the controversy by a new treaty, then either might undertake to redress, according to its own judgment, the grievance complained of. But, before a resort to arms, in order to retain the respect of mankind, it would be necessary to make an honest effort to select capable and impartial arbitrators. The least trickery to defeat the arbitration, and at the same time apparently comply with the requirements of the treaty, would be certain to bring general odium on the guilty party, to avoid which, nations and individuals, in this age of the world, will do much.

It may be objected, that the arbitrators, through imbecility or corruption, may err in their award. It is not likely they will be destitute of capacity. If they are, it will be the fault of those who select such. But suppose they are corrupt, and should render an award palpably unjust, what is then to be done? It is a legal maxim, that fraud vitiates everything. All contracts, judgments and awards fraudulently obtained, are to be set aside and held for naught; and there is a chancery jurisdiction provided in well-regulated

governments to supervise and annul every transaction based upon fraud. Now, in case the arbitrators should make a fraudulent award, then the party injured by it must of necessity, as there is no higher jurisdiction to supervise and annul it, refuse to execute it, and publish to the world their reasons for the refusal. If, in doing so, it could be shown that the award was the result of partiality or corruption, the honest sentiment of mankind would justify the nation injured by it in resisting its execution by war, should milder means prove ineffectual. Thus, in case national differences are submitted to arbitrators for adjustment, and the award should be of such a character that one of the parties cannot submit to it, resistance and war may be resorted to in the end.

It may be asked, why go through the forms of an arbitration, unless the award is to be conclusive and final? What good can result from the delay, the expense, and the ceremonies of an arbitration, if the parties to it may, after it is over, still renew the quarrel and go to war? We answer, much good. The necessary delay in selecting the arbitrators, and preparing for and conducting the trial, will prevent hasty declarations of war. It will allow time for the blood to cool, and for the mind to reflect. Calm deliberation is the friend of peace. The award will show the contending nations what opinion disinterested judges entertain of their quarrel. Just and able arbitrators will, by their reasonings in regard to the controversy, exhibit the right and justice of the case, and the wrong committed by one or both parties, in such a clear light, that all disinterested persons will perceive what ought to be done for the true interest of the disputants. An award sanctioned by the common sense and justice of the world, could not be resisted by either party, unless ruin, manifest and inevitable, would be the consequence of executing it. In that event, there is a higher principle which would allow resistance—the principle of self-preservation. Nations and individuals may sometimes be placed in such circumstances, that they may rightfully refuse to execute their engagements, entered into through providence, want of forecast, or pressing necessity. Many examples might be given by way of illustration; but we shall mention only one case. By treaty made in 1778, the United States agreed to guaranty to France, “forever, against all other powers, her present possessions in America.” The alliance with France, which so essentially aided us in the war of the Revolution, if we are not entirely indebted to it for our national independence, required us to take part in her future wars, so far at least as to make good the above guaranty. But the Father of his Country, considering the imminent peril which we should incur by the fulfilment of this stipulation of the treaty, issued his celebrated proclamation of neutrality, in 1793, refusing to take part on the side of France against England in the war then raging, even to protect the French West India colonies. So, likewise, where nations refer a controversy to arbitration, and the award is such as to put the very existence of the unsuccessful party in jeopardy by its specific execution, the nation decided against is not bound to sacrifice itself. In all such cases, however, there is the strongest moral obligation to make adequate compensation, if it be possible. Thus there can be no danger to the real interest of any nation likely to result from the submission of disputes with other nations to arbitration, as the question of executing the award will remain open after it has been made, and its execution may be resisted for sufficient cause. But just arbitrators will always regard the condition of the party against whom the award is to be made, and will not require impossible things—things that are morally impossible, because they cannot be conceded without ruin.

Nations, by a reference of their disputes to arbitrators, might reasonably calculate that, however onerous the award, its fulfilment would not cost as much as the resort to war. If its execution presents a burden somewhat op-

pressive, still that which would be saddled upon the people by war, in all probability, would be more grievous.

It sometimes happens, that the "point of honor" between nations seems to demand immediate action, and a blow is given without time for deliberation. The nation struck resents, and a war is the consequence. Treaty stipulations requiring arbitration, would be a salutary remedy in such cases. The "point of honor" would then consist in adhering to the treaty.

Contemplated in all its aspects, the committee perceive no evils likely to result from treaty stipulations in favor of referring national disputes to arbitration for adjustment. Believing that much good will result, they do not hesitate to recommend, as a part of our permanent foreign policy, the incorporation of a provision in all treaties to the effect that, should controversies arise, they shall be submitted to the decision of disinterested and impartial arbitrators, to be mutually chosen, with the privilege on the part of the arbitrators to select an umpire, in case they are equally divided.

The present state of the world is peculiarly favorable for the introduction of such a policy. The powerful Christian nations are at peace with each other. Their prosperity and happiness have been rapidly advancing during the years of peace they have enjoyed. No greater calamity can befall them than breaking up the peace which so happily prevails.

The United States, of all others, is the proper country to propose this policy to the nations of the earth. We have shown in our past history a capacity for war. The love of military glory is a passion as strong with us as with any other people, if not stronger. Our institutions invite every citizen to become a soldier in time of war. Our ranks are filled with volunteers panting for an opportunity to distinguish themselves. Our young men rush to battle with the full assurance, that the highest civil honors often reward the toils and dangers of the triumphant soldier. Our institutions, therefore, tend to make us a military people. We are rapidly growing in power. Our progress is without a parallel. Under such circumstances, in proposing a policy of peace, it cannot be supposed that we are influenced by any other motives than those which spring from the purest philanthropy. The policy proposed is adverse to aggression. It respects the rights of all nations. Its object is "peace on earth, good will to men."

May we not hope to be successful in our efforts for peace? So far as national arbitrations have been tried, we do not know any case where the award, however complained of, has been productive of a hundredth part of the evil which would have resulted from war. Take any award which has been rendered, concede it to be wrong, admit that the arbitrators were mistaken and erred in judgment, and then weigh and compare the evils which would result from the execution of such award with those which follow a state of war; and it will be found that war is infinitely the greater evil. So far as past experience can be relied on, we think it favors the policy of adopting national arbitrations as the best means of settling national disputes.

There are powerful and rapidly accumulating interests in favor of peace, and adverse to war. The interests of commerce, which, through the enterprise of Christian nations, have penetrated almost every region of the earth, binding our race together by a more intimate intercourse and stronger fellowship, would be greatly injured by a state of war. These interests appeal to the rulers of mankind, and ask for peace.

The interests of science, civilization and Christianity implore the governments of the world to suppress wars. The scientific traveller desires to explore every square mile of the globe, to study its botany and mineralogy, its reptiles, birds and beasts, its soils and climates, its population and their manners and customs, their laws and religion, and thus to acquire and diffuse

that knowledge which will enlarge and liberalize the mind, instruct commerce where to find supplies to purchase, and markets in which to sell, and teach agriculture by spreading the knowledge of the implements and tillage and productions best suited to the various soils and climates of the earth, as ascertained by the experience of centuries. War obstructs all this, because during a state of war, travellers are regarded with suspicion, if not arrested as spies.

Civilization and Christianity are making vigorous efforts to penetrate and enlighten the dark lands of barbarism and idolatry. The devout missionary looks forward with undoubting faith to the period when peace, universal and permanent, shall pervade the earth, when nations "shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks," and when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." He believes that the day is coming when the tactics of death and destruction will cease to be a study among men. He believes that the promised Messiah has come, that "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end," and that "he shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." He believes, that this great purpose is to be brought about by human agency, acting under the influence of the Spirit of God; and, with this faith, he goes forth to "preach the gospel to every creature," according to the command of his divine Master. His mission is one of love and peace. His purpose is to elevate man by instructing his mind and soul, and to make him a new creature in Christ Jesus. This work of missions, as the best means of converting heathen nations to the doctrines and faith of Christianity, has grown in popular favor with all classes of Christians. It has been adopted alike by Catholic and Protestant. It is relied on to bring all nations into a common brotherhood, by spreading over the earth a common religion, in which the same Decalogue, the same moral principles, shall be taught and embraced by all. This great object of Christian effort would be obstructed, if not entirely defeated, by the prevalence of wars. It is difficult, where peace and commercial intercourse exist between a Christian and an anti-Christian nation, for the missionary of the former to penetrate the territories, and conciliate the favor and esteem of the heathen. It would be impossible in a state of war.

The committee believe, that the petitions presented to them indicate that there is a strong religious and philanthropic sentiment pervading our whole country in favor of peace among all nations. This sentiment is universal among Christians of all denominations, in the opinion of the committee, and is manifesting itself through the petitions before us. The political strength of the Christians of our country is such as to command attention and respect on all occasions, even if we did not entirely concur in their views; but when, as in this case, the members of the committee heartily concur with what they believe to be the Christian sentiment of the country, it is an occasion for congratulation that they have the opportunity of co-operating with the memorialists in efforts to accomplish their noble purpose.

The committee recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Senate advise the President to secure, whenever it may be practicable, a stipulation in all treaties hereafter entered into with other nations, providing for the adjustment of any misunderstanding or controversy which may arise between the contracting parties, by referring the same to the decision of disinterested and impartial arbitrators, to be mutually chosen.

Mr. Underwood presented, also, a Report on International Religious Toleration, which we design to publish, when the time returns for petitioning Congress, with a view of obtaining a large number of petitions for both these objects from all parts of the country.